

IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020
CONCERNING

Pc Lee-Storey and Former Pc Jowett.

Provisional Decision regarding restrictions for hearing

1. Pc Lee-Storey and former Pc Jowett are to appear before a misconduct hearing commencing 24th September 2026 to face allegations regarding breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.
2. The alleged breaches relate to their attendance at a domestic-related incident on 29th October 2024.
3. At a pre hearing on 25th August 2026, it was agreed that one witness would be called to give live evidence, Ps Thomas.
4. The Appropriate Authority has applied for anonymity for the members of the public that are involved in this incident. The members of the public are not to be called as witnesses. Provisional ciphers have been allocated on the Reg 30 notice.
5. Person B is a high risk victim of domestic abuse.
6. Person A is the alleged perpetrator of that abuse.
7. In coming to a decision on this application, I have taken into account the advice of the Legally Qualified Person, Emma Hutchinson.
8. I remind myself of the purpose of the police misconduct regime, which is threefold:
 - a. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service,
 - b. To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
 - c. To protect the public
9. I remind myself that in these proceedings there is a presumption towards open justice and so that proceedings go ahead in public, without restriction. Regulation 39 (3)(1) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 states; “*Subject to paragraph (3), a misconduct hearing*

must be in public.” There is a public interest in ensuring the transparency of proceedings, and in demonstrating to the public the steps taken to maintain the profession.

10. Under Regulation 39(3) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, the Chair can impose restrictions on an open hearing. At paragraph 11.84, the Home Office guidance provides non-exhaustive guidance on factors that may be taken into account when considering the merit of imposing any restrictions. This includes, at (g), the welfare of a third party, together with any other relevant circumstances.
11. I am advised by the Legally qualified person that *“You, as Chair should consider whether identifying the third party is necessary for the public properly to understand the allegations and proceedings, the effect that identification may have upon the third party, and whether those considerations outweigh the public interest in open proceedings. If satisfied that protection is necessary, the proposed used if a cipher would be a limited measure which would allow the substance of the evidence and proceedings to remain public. Therefore, you as Chair may direct under regulation 39(3)(c) that the third parties be referred to as Person A and Person B and prohibit publication of their name and any information likely to identify them.”*
12. I note the further information provided by the AA in relation to the wishes of Person A. *“The AA note that Person B has confirmed that she wishes to be anonymised as she is concerned as to the impact that naming her in these proceedings would exacerbate matters with her granddaughter. The AA can confirm that whilst there are no live criminal proceedings relating to those individuals, Person B’s granddaughter did appear before the Court only last month in respect of breaching a restraining order which is in place to protect Person B. Matters between the parties has clearly not ceased and concerns remain current. The AA can also confirm that there remains a place of interest marker on Person B’s address due to such concerns.*

PROVISIONAL DECISION - RESTRICTIONS TO BE IMPOSED

13. I am satisfied that publicly identifying Person A and Person B within these proceedings may exacerbate difficulties between them which remain ongoing.
14. I am satisfied that it is not necessary to name Persons A and B in order for the public to properly understand the allegations that are made against the officers. The nature and extent of the allegations can be fully explored without naming the individuals who are subject of the alleged behaviours by the officers. The purpose of the police misconduct

regime, in holding the officers to account, can properly be met without naming the members of the public involved.

15. Neither Person A or Person B is called to give evidence within these proceedings. The officers do not contest anything that is in the information provided by Person B. Person A has given no information to the investigation.
16. Whilst I recognise the importance of open justice, I take into account the needs of the witness and in particular any ongoing risk to them.
- 17. I direct under regulation 39(3)(c) that the third parties be referred to as Person A and Person B and I prohibit publication of their name and any information likely to identify them.**

PUBLIC NOTICE and FINAL DECISION

18. This is my provisional decision on restrictions to be applied during these proceedings. A final decision can not be determined until interested parties, including the media, have had the opportunity to make any representations.
19. I direct that at the time the public notice is published, it is clear that this provisional decision on restrictions has been made, and that interested parties are invited to make any representations.
20. A final determination will be made at the start of the hearing.

Julia Debenham
Chair

11th September 2026